

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and still further reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, are respectfully requested in light of the remarks that follow.

It is again requested that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy in grandparent Appln. No. 09/051,199, as well as the claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. This application is a continuation of Appln. No. 09/505,874, which is a divisional of Appln. No. 09/051,199, which is the U.S. national phase of PCT/FR96/01532 and claims the priority of FR 95/11951, filed October 5, 1995. The domestic priorities are claimed in the first paragraph of the specification as filed. The foreign priority is claimed in part 11 of the Request for Filing Continuation Application filed February 20, 2002.

By this amendment, Claims 1-20, 23 and 24 are proposed to be canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 21, 22 and 25-50 remain in the application.

The indications that the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Latorse have not been maintained are noted, with appreciation. It is again respectfully pointed out that the correct spelling of the inventor's name on the reference patent is Latorse, not Latrose. This should be corrected on the Form PTO-892 so that the patent will be listed correctly when the present application issues to patent.

The rejection of Claims 1-20, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Oguri has been maintained. In the Official Action, Claims 27 and 28 were added to this rejection. Claims 1-20, 23 and 24 have been canceled, rendering

the rejection moot with respect to those claims. As for Claims 27 and 28, in a telephone interview on February 19, 2004, the undersigned pointed out to the Examiner that the rejection of Claims 27 and 28 was inconsistent with the allowance of Claim 21, from which Claims 27 and 28 depend. The Examiner agreed that the rejection of these claims was inadvertent and that Claims 27 and 28 should have been listed as allowable subject matter.

As indicated by Examiner Pryor in the Interview Summary, "Allowable Subject Matter in Office Action dated 1/27/04 should have read: Claims 21, 22, 25-50 are allowable."

Only Claims 21-22 and 25-50 will remain in this application upon entry of this amendment. The Examiner has indicated that all of these claims are allowable. Therefore, it is believed that entry of this amendment and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are next in order and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: April 9, 2004

By: Mary Katherine Baumeister
Mary Katherine Baumeister
Registration No. 26,254

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620